



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,814	08/25/2003	Cheng Chung Wang	10111953	2353

34283 7590 09/10/2008
QUINTERO LAW OFFICE, PC
2210 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
SANTA MONICA, CA 90405

EXAMINER

FREAY, CHARLES GRANT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3746

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4
5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8
9

10 Ex parte CHENG CHUNG WANG
11
12

13 Appeal 2008-0762
14 Application 10/647,814
15 Technology Center 3700
16
17

18 Oral Hearing Held: July 9, 2008
19
20

21
22 Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, JENNIFER D. BAHR, and
23 JOHN C. KERINS, Administrative Patent Judges
24

25
26 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:
27

28 NELSON A. QUINTERO
29 Quintero Law Offices, PC
30 2210 Main Street, Suite 200
31 Santa Monica, CA 90405
32
33
34

35 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on July 9, 2008, commencing
36 at 10:30 a.m. at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street,
37 Alexandria, Virginia.

PROCEEDINGS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

JUDGE PATE: Good Morning Mr. Quintero

NELSON QUINTERO: Good morning.

JUDGE PATE: You can step up to the podium and introduce your
colleague.

NELSON QUINTERO: This is Kurt Glitzenstein.

KURT GLITZENSTEIN: Good morning, I'm from Fish &
Richardson.

JUDGE PATE: Ok, thank you. We've had a chance to look over this
case before the hearing and we're ready to hear your arguments for
patentability.

NELSON QUINTERO: Ok. Your honors, the claims at issue in this
appeal recite an inflatable product, including at least an inflatable body, a
socket built into the inflatable body, an electric pump including a pump body
and an air outlet connected to the socket to pump the inflatable body,
wherein the pump body is wholly or partially located in the socket. The
disagreement between the appellant and the examiner revolves around the
single and simple term inflatable body. On appellants construction, the
examiner has never disputed the claims are patentable. Moreover, on
application of the examiners construction, it's our view that the prior art
references do not anticipate the claims at issue. I will first address
appellants' construction of the term inflatable body. It's our construction of
this term that it refers to a substantially air tight structure that expands or
swells when filled with air or other gas. As noted, the examiner has never
disputed that on this construction, appellant should prevail. In particular, the

1 alleged sockets of the prior art are clearly not built into the inflatable body
2 since the alleged sockets are not built into a substantially air tight structure
3 that expands when filled with air.

4 JUDGE PATE: This is the second...this is the second ground for it.

5 NELSON QUINTERO: No, I'm saying that in our construction of the
6 term inflatable body, the sockets of the prior art in Wortman and Higgs are
7 not built into our construction of the term inflatable body.

8 JUDGE PATE: Ok. Ok so you're coupling those two arguments
9 together?

10 NELSON QUINTERO: No, I'm giving our argument first.

11 JUDGE PATE: Ok. Go ahead.

12 NELSON QUINTERO: Which is on our construction that it would
13 prevail. But the examiners proposed construction is a body that expands
14 when filled with air or other gas, and so the only difference between our two
15 constructions, the substantial difference, is that ours is substantially airtight.

16 JUDGE PATE: How do you get around the references referring to
17 their bodies, although they do leak, as inflating? They keep saying they
18 inflate these chambers even though they're not totally sealed.

19 NELSON QUINTERO: Again our term, our definition of the term is
20 *substantially airtight* and...

21 JUDGE PATE: Well then aren't they substantially airtight? They're
22 designed to slowly leak.

23 NELSON QUINTERO: The parts that are leaking...I see you're
24 talking about Higgs here. The part that's substantially leaking in Higgs is the
25 air cushion, not the whole mattress as a whole. So it's the air cushion, which
26 we would call a substantially airtight structure. Clearly when it's in use, it

1 doesn't just deflate immediately. When the user sits on it, it doesn't deflate.
2 In order to be pumped in the first place, and in order for it to maintain some
3 structure when the user sits on it, it has to be a least substantially airtight.

4 JUDGE PATE: Ok.

5 NELSON QUINTERO: Ok. Appellant submits that in the context of
6 the present application, one cannot reasonably interpret the term inflatable
7 body in light of the relevant evidence without concluding that it must be at
8 least substantially airtight. That is the relevant evidence in Phillips v. AWH
9 Corp.

10 It's the words of the claims themselves, remainder of the specification, the
11 prosecution history, extrinsic evidence concerning the relevant scientific
12 principles, and the meaning of technical terms and the state of the art, and is
13 set forth in In re Hyatt, the claim term must be interpreted in a way that is
14 reasonable and consistent with the specification. As we've recited in the
15 preamble here, the art in question is that of inflatable products. As set forth
16 in the claim the inflatable body is the element of the inflatable product that is
17 pumped i.e. inflated or deflated by the electric pump. In order for an
18 inflatable body of an inflatable product to be filled with air, inflated or
19 deflated such that it causes the body to expand, it must be substantially
20 airtight. It's this characteristic of being substantially airtight that prevents it
21 from deflating by itself or the air escaping into the atmosphere. Furthermore,
22 construing the term inflatable body without having a substantially airtight
23 characteristic would be inconsistent with the specification. The specification
24 describes the body of an airbed that is pumped by an electric pump.
25 Pumping means either bringing air from outside the inflatable body inside,
26 or from inside the inflatable body outside i.e. inflating or deflating. There

1 would be no need to deflate the inflatable body with the pump if it wasn't
2 substantially airtight to begin with. There are numerous references to the
3 substantially airtight characteristic in the specification. Page 6 lines 24 – 27
4 it refers to the cap to seal the airbed after inflating operation. There would be
5 no need to seal it if it were not substantially airtight. The uh... page 4 line 29
6 describes an O-ring, and later on it describes that the O-ring prevents the
7 airbed from leaking. There's, on page 5 line 5 there's a check valve 208 and
8 it's described later on by removing the pump and that check valve, the
9 airbed can then deflate. Pages 5 and 6, a cap 37 is used to seal or unseal the
10 airbed. Pages 10 and 11 there's an embodiment described in which a rubber
11 pad 522 is used to eliminate gaps to prevent leaking. The next embodiments
12 involve inflation/deflation and also include structure to prevent inflation...to
13 prevent leakage after inflation of the airbed. As we set forth in the appeal
14 brief and the reply brief, the structure that the examiner identifies as the
15 alleged body, inflatable body i.e. the mattress 30 as a whole of Wortman or
16 mattress 3 as a whole of Higgs, is not a substantially airtight structure so as
17 to... that expands or swells when filled with air or other gas. Furthermore,
18 the structure that the examiner identifies as the sockets, is not built into what
19 is that substantially airtight structure that expands or swells when filled with
20 air or other gas i.e. the notch 63 in Wortman or the hollow compartment 22
21 in Higgs are not built into the inflatable cushions 44 and 46 or the inflatable
22 --- 28 in Higgs. Therefore, it is our belief that on our constructions, we
23 should prevail. The examiner's construction, which I mentioned is fairly
24 similar to ours, is a body that expands when filled with air or other gas. It's
25 our view even when using this construction the mattress 30 in Wortman or
26 the mattress 3 in Higgs do not meet this definition, cannot be fairly viewed

1 as inflatable bodies. Specifically, in Wortman, he describes the inflatable
2 body as including cribs 34 and 36 which are of a solid foam material,
3 inflatable cushions 44 and 46, and the cloth mattress cover 48 as total being
4 the inflatable body. Cribs define a rigid framework on in which an inflatable
5 body, i.e. the cushions, is placed. The cloth mattress cover is disposed over
6 the cribs and the inflatable cushions. When taken as a whole, this whole
7 structure is not filled with air. It's only the cushion that's filled with air.
8 Furthermore, when taken as a whole this body doesn't expand. In the reply
9 brief we included the figures 12, 13 and 14 from Wortman, which show that
10 the cribs maintain exactly the same shape during inflation and deflation. It
11 doesn't grow or expand.

12 JUDGE PATE: Go on to Higgs.

13 NELSON QUINTERO: Higgs, ok. With Higgs also we've shown a
14 figure from Higgs and if you have that figure handy it shows two states of
15 inflation. One is 28 which is you can see in 28 it's partially occupying that
16 void and in 28-1 it's expanded to fill that void completely. Again that
17 structure as a whole is not expanding in Higgs. And again in Higgs, that
18 material outside there is foam material, which is not airtight. It is dense. It's
19 not substantially airtight. The examiner has brought up two points. One is
20 the low loss air mattress that you described, which I've already addressed.
21 And in addition, again what we think what the examiner's issue is is not
22 addressing the dichotomy between inflatable product and inflatable body.

23 JUDGE PATE: All right, I think we understand the argument. Do you
24 have any questions Judge Kerins?

25 JUDGE KERINS: No I don't.

26 JUDGE PATE: Judge Bahr?

1 JUDGE BAHR: No.

2 JUDGE PATE: No questions from me either. We're going to take this
3 case under advisement. I thank you for your presentation.

4 NELSON QUINTERO: Thank you.

5 (Whereupon, at approximately 10:28 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)